Hidden Lane Landfill NPL Site
Interim Action
Proposed Plan Public Meeting

April 26, 2018
• Introduction of the site team and guests
• Purpose of this meeting and ground rules
• Describe the Superfund Process
• Site History and Why Action is Necessary
• Review of alternatives evaluated
• Discussion of the Preferred Remedy
• Question and Comments
Purpose

• Residences that are exposed or potentially exposed to TCE contaminated groundwater.

• Present EPA’s Proposed Plan to extend public waterline into Broad Run Farms

• Request feedback, questions and comments from the public on EPA’s proposed action
Superfund Process

What comes next:
1. Proposed Plan Released on April 19th
2. 60 Day Public comment Period lasts from April 19th to June 18th
3. Record of Decision (ROD) – 6 months
4. Design of Remedy – 1 year
5. Remedy construction 6-12 months
Site History
Remedial Investigation Findings

• **Groundwater:** Contaminated by TCE and potential breakdown products

• **Landfill:** Appropriately capped with 2 ft. clay layer

• **Methane:** No detection since 2011, EPA stopped sampling for methane is 2017

• **Soil, Surface Water & Sediments:** No detection above EPA Human Health or Ecological Risk numbers
Remedial Action Objective (RAO)

Prevent human exposure to Site-related groundwater contamination in private wells

Alternative 1: No Action

Alternative 2: Land Use Controls (LUCs) to Mitigate Exposure to Contaminants in Groundwater

Alternative 3: Continued Maintenance of Point-of-Entry Treatment Systems (POETS) w/ LUCs

Alternative 4: Extension of Public Waterlines and connection of affected or potentially affected properties w/ LUCs.
Land Use Controls to Mitigate Exposure to Contaminants in Groundwater

- Land use controls alone are not protective because they do not supply a safe source water.

- Superfund Law require remedy be protective in the long term

- Enables EPA to manage future “what if “ scenarios

➤ Will a future resident be protected?
Continued Maintenance of Point-of-Entry Treatment Systems (POETS) w/ LUCs

- Continued O&M of treatment systems until groundwater is safe for public consumption
  - Continue to monitor treatment systems four times a year
  - Replacement of carbon units as needed
- Conduct residential well sampling to locate additional homes needing treatment
- Land Use Controls such as new homes within affected area must have carbon treatment systems
## Pros and Cons of POETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. POETS currently in place and easily added</td>
<td>1. Require quarterly monitoring, and intrusion into residential homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No water bill</td>
<td>2. Less protective than waterline due to inadvertent changes to plumbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. No water if electricity goes out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Potential cost of pump replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Potential higher insurance premiums due to lack of fire hydrants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preferred Alternative 4-Proposed Remedy
Public Waterline with LUCs

- Extend existing waterline into Broad Run Farms to address residences currently or potentially impacted by site related contaminants
- Land Use Controls such as residences within buffer zone must be connected to public water
- Timing
  - Design: 1 year
  - Construction: 6-12 months
  - LUC: last step
Buffer Zone

- Conduct additional residential well sampling to locate additional properties at risk and better define buffer zone
- Residences within buffer zone will be offered free connection, and abandonment of existing well
- Residences may request to keep wells for non-potable use
- Not essential for properties outside buffer zone to connect
  ➢ May request connection, cost to be determined by Loudoun Water
**Non-Potable Use Wells**

- Existing wells may be used to water grass or wash cars
- Drinking well water or using water to fill pools or water vegetables is not generally advised
- EPA will work with residents to better understand risks
Land Use Control Examples

• Local Zoning Ordnance, Deed Notification, or Deed Restriction

• Controls jointly developed by EPA, County and Property Owner

• Potential Types of Restrictions
  ➢ Residences within affected area must connect to waterline
  ➢ No wells within affected area may use well water for potable use without treatment
Pros and Cons of Connecting to Waterline

**Pros**

1. Continuous source safe water
2. No more quarterly intrusion into house
3. Potential Lower Electric Bill
4. Potential Lower Insurance Bill
5. No more O&M costs of well
6. Potential Increase in property value

**Cons**

1. New Water Bill
## Cost Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Description</th>
<th>Capital costs</th>
<th>Annual O&amp;M Costs</th>
<th>Projected future costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued Maintenance of POETS</td>
<td>$99,203</td>
<td>$333,223</td>
<td>$10,095,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of Public Waterline</td>
<td>$6,743,450</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$6,743,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank You for Attending

Contact Information
Bruce Rundell: Remedial Project Manager
   215-814-3317
   rundell.bruce@epa.gov

Larry Johnson: Community Involvement Coordinator
   215-814-3239
   johnson.larry-c@epa.gov

Brian Hamilton: State and Congressional Liaison
   215-814-5497
   hamilton.brian@epa.gov
Questions?